UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,036	10/27/2000	Charles P. Bobbitt	5053-30801	6768

7590 01/11/2008

Eric B Meyertons
Conley Rose & Tayon P C
P O Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER	
COLBERT, ELLA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3694	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/699,036	BOBBITT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ella Colbert	3694	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11, 13-19, 21-30, 32-34, 36-42, 44-57, 59-61, 63-69, 71-73, and 147-152* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-11,13-19,21-30,32-34,36-42,44-57,59-61,63-69,71-73 and 147-152.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-19, 21-30, 32-34, 36-42, 44-47, 59-61, 63-69, 71-73, and 147-152 are pending. Claims 1, 24, and 51 have been amended in the amendment and Request for Continued Examination filed 10/11/07.

2. The claim objection for claim 1 has been overcome by Applicants' amendment and is hereby withdrawn.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/11/07 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-19, 21-30, 32-34, 36-42, 44-57, 59-61, 63-69, 71-73, and 147-152 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,386,571) Kurz in view of (US 2003/0014421) Jung.

As per claims 1, 24, and 51, Kurz teaches, a method, a system, and a carrier medium comprising program instructions for: displaying at least two processing relationship object representations on a display screen in data communication with a Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system comprising a database; Creating a model of an FSO comprising a plurality of processing relationship software objects, wherein creating the model of the FSO comprises: selecting at least two processing relationship object representations from the displayed processing relationship object representations; preparing a processing relationship definition for at least two of the selected processing relationship object representations, wherein preparing the processing relationship includes: creating a highest level processing relationship object in a processing structure, wherein the highest level processing relationship object represents an FSO; creating a highest level processing relationship object in a processing relationship structure, wherein the highest level processing relationship object represents an FSO; creating a plurality of lower level processing objects in the processing relationship structure, wherein the plurality of lower level processing relationship objects in the processing relationship structure are descendents of the highest level processing relationship object, wherein one or more of the lower level processing relationship objects represents a bank branch office, a regional bank, a credit card issuer, or an acquirer; processing at least one of the plurality of lower level processing relationship objects; processing the relationship definitions and storing each processing relationship definition in the database (col. 6, lines 13-64 and col. 11, lines 9-20 and fig. 2C- shows a financial service organization involving sales where each of

the boxes is an object, each line between the boxes is a relationship with the dotted lines representing different levels. The other types of entities besides the business unit are optionally recited and thus carry no patentable weight. Kurz did not expressly disclose a FSO. Jung in fig.'s 34A and 34B shows relationship objects in a hierarchy in a business relationship (FSO).

Claim 24, Kurz discloses, a computer program (col. 4, lines 36-58); a computer system (col. 2, lines 55-61); the computer program is executable on the computer system (col. 2, lines 41-61 and col. 4, lines 36-58).

This independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claim 1.

Claim 51, Kurz discloses, displaying at least two processing relationship object representations on a display screen in data communication with a Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system comprising a database (col. 10, lines 30-46 and col. 11, lines 10-20); selecting at least two processing relationship object representations from the displayed processing relationship object representations (col. 8, lines 4-26 –display).

This independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claims 1 and 24.

As per claims 2, 25, and 52, Kurz discloses, wherein each processing relationship definition stored in the database is configured for use in preparing a processing relationship value from an FSO transaction-related data in the FSO computer system (col. 8, line 4-col. 9, line 2 and fig. 5-shows a value for each block and relationship).

As per claims 3, 26, and 53, Kurz discloses, wherein the processing relationship value is configured for use in identifying an FSO business entity as an owner of the FSO transaction-related data (col. 7, line 53-col. 8, line 3).

As per claims 4, 27, 54, 147, and 150, Kurz discloses, wherein the processing relationship value is configured for use in identifying an FSO business entity as an owner of the FSO transaction-related data, wherein the FSO business entity is a bank branch office or a regional bank or a credit card line or an issuer or an acquirer. In Fig. 4E of Kurz shows a business entity as a company and a business unit (see col. 7, line 53-col. 8, line 27).

As per claims 5, 28, 55, and 149, Kurz discloses, wherein the selecting one or more processing relationship object representations is performed by a user of the FSO computer system (col. 5, line 65-col. 6, line 25-suggests that a user had to perform the selection of the relationship objects). This reads on claim limitation 5.

As per claims 6, 29, and 56, Kurz discloses, wherein the selecting one or more processing relationship object representations is programmable or executable by an expert system (col. 4, lines 36-58).

As per claims 7, 30, and 57, Kurz discloses, wherein the storing the processing relationship definition in the database comprises transferring the processing relationship definition to a report record definition stored in the database (col. 10, lines 30-46 and col. 11, lines 9-20).

As per claims 9, 32, 59, and 152, Kurz discloses, wherein the processing relationship structure is expanded by inserting one or more processing relationship

objects as descendants of the highest level processing relationship object (col. 5, lines20-68 and fig. 2C- shows where one or more relationship objects are descendents of the highest level processing relationship object can be inserted).

As per claims 10, 33, and 60, Kurz discloses, wherein the processing relationship structure is edited by inserting or deleting one or more processing relationship objects, wherein each of the one or more processing relationship objects are descendents of the highest level processing relationship object (Fig's 1, 2A-2C and 3A and 3B –shows updating which is considered a form of editing- adding, deleting, and changing).

As per claims 11, 34, 61, 148, 151, Kurz discloses, wherein the displaying one or more processing relationship object representations on a display screen comprises displaying values associated with a sequence number and a level number.(Fig. 5 – shows displayed values in a sequence number for the lower level processing objects and the name identifies a level number in the processing relationship structure).

As per claims 13, 36, and 63, Kurz discloses, wherein the displaying one or more processing relationship object representations on a display screen comprises displaying values associated with an object name, an object description and an object number for a displayed processing relationship object (col. 5, line 36-col. 6, line 25).

As per claims 14, 37, and 64, Kurz discloses, wherein the object name identities a unique name assigned to an object (col. 5, lines 36-68).

As per claims 15, 28, and 65, Kurz discloses, wherein the database is relational or object oriented (col. 4, lines 36-39–object oriented database and col. 11, lines 9-11-relational database).

As per claims 16, 39, and 66, Kurz did not expressly disclose, wherein the selecting a first processing relationship object representation from one or more processing relationship object representations comprises positioning a cursor of an user input device above the first processing relationship object representation and clicking a button of the user input device. However, Kurz does disclose a computer system and displaying. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify in Kurz because such a modification would allow Kurz to diplay a representation of the business model on the display screen and the system which may also include one or more user input devices such as a keyboard for entering data or commands and one or more cursor control devices such as a mouse for using a cursor to modify a business model viewed on a display screen.

As per claims 17, 40, and 67, Kurz discloses, wherein the preparing a processing relationship definition comprises creating or editing an object associated with each of the selected processing relationship object representation (col. 1, line 44-col. 2, line 26).

As per claims 18, 41, and 68, Kurz discloses, wherein the creating the object comprises identifying one or more values and one or more properties (col. 2, lines 25-61).

As per claims19, 42, and 69, Kurz discloses, wherein the preparing a processing relationship definition comprises identifying one or more properties of an object associated with each of the selected processing relationship object representation (col. 5, line 36-col. 6, line 25).

As per claims 21, 44, and 71, Kurz failed to disclose, wherein the processing relationship object representations comprises an icon displayed on the display screen of the FSO computer system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kurz in view of his teachings of a display and mouse input device because such a modification would allow Kurz to have a document presented to an employee of the FSO or to a customer graphical objects such as icons.

As per claims 22, 45, and 72, Kurz discloses, wherein a user of the FSO computer system executes a processing relationship configuration program to prepare the processing relationship definition (col. 4, lines 36-58).

As per claims 23, 46, and 73, Kurz discloses, wherein the user of FSO computer system executes a processing relationship configuration program to reconfigure and store in the database the processing relationship definition in response to changing business conditions (col. 6, lines 25-64).

As per claim 47, Kurz discloses, wherein the computer system comprises a display device coupled to the computer system to display data (col. 2, lines 56-61 and col. 3, lines 1-16).

As per claim 48, Kurz discloses, The system of claim 47, wherein the display device is a display screen (col. 3, lines 1-9).

As per claim 49, Kurz discloses, wherein the computer system comprises a user input device coupled to the computer system to enter data (col. 3, lines 1-9).

As per claim 50, Pinard discloses, wherein the user input device is a mouse or a keyboard (col. 3, lines 1-9).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nagai et al (US6,275,977) disclosed object classes as a tree structure.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims above have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 571-272-6741. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday, 5:30AM-3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

January 7, 2008

ELLA COLBERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER